

Arden Board of Assessors April 17, 2006 Present: Borders, Bovard, Falco, Marconi, O'Regan, Varley, Wheeler, and guest, Warren Rosenkrantz

The minutes of the March meeting were distributed and read. Several questions were raised and corrections were made.

Carl Falco read a letter from Aaron Hamburger regarding the estimate of the reserve at the end of the FY 2005-06. Carl also mentioned he sent everyone an URL for the county web site which details the tax history of every parcel. Tom Wheeler handed out a copy of an article he wrote in 1994 on how value is determined as raw land is turned into a development.

At the close of the last meeting we made a motion on "rates" which was defeated. Do we wish to go back to that discussion or move forward to tonight's topic of domiciles? Consensus was to move forward.

Comments:

1. Last year's board decided to consider domiciles at 100% of A rate for each domicile assuming each was 2,000 sq. ft.
2. Why was the change from 6,500 sq. ft. to 2,000?
3. It didn't play out, some leaseholds ran out of land before all their extra domiciles paid.
4. As it was implemented, less was collected for extra domiciles and therefore single domiciles had to pay more.
5. Home based business (the Arden exemption to the UDC) gives all leaseholds a privilege, but not as great a one as extra domiciles.
6. In the past it was assumed that extra domiciles were "grandfathered in" and the footprint of that and the primary domicile could not be changed. We discovered that the county did not accept the "grandfather" theory and the Trustees decided to leave the onus on the Leaseholder to seek a variance which would allow changes to footprint.
7. Current rule is a gift to one extra domicile.
8. Why was [a previous year's proposal] 167%, why not 125% of A rate?
9. 167% of A on 2,000 sq. ft. = 80% of A on 6,500 sq. ft.
10. Sometimes it seems we just don't want to anger people.
11. What should the second one be worth?
12. Not all are domiciles, e.g. the Arden Club, if we develop another category, the money moves a little differently. We could determine that the Craft Shop Museum is a benefit to the town.
13. Until we crunch the numbers, how can we decide what is fair? I hear a move toward evening out the discrepancy.
14. What are we calling a privilege? Is it more of a privilege to have 4 extra domiciles? Or 1 extra? What are we valuing?
15. I think it is linear if 3 is more valuable than 2.

16. Do we value the extra ones? Is it a benefit to the community? Seems to be a trend that extra domiciles are disappearing. This is a social engineering question
17. I think we are leaning to multiple domiciles across the community, so the baby boomers can afford to stay in the village.
18. At next meeting we can take a real time look at several scenarios. Next meeting scheduled is a Public Hearing on May 16.
19. Carl will be away. It was decided to add a meeting on **Tuesday, May 2, 2006 at the BWVC**. Elizabeth Varley will schedule the room, Walter Borders will post the change on the web-site, and Mary Marconi will post the notice on the town bulletin boards.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted, Elizabeth Varley, Secretary